

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.nspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/726,372	12/01/2000	Hans-Rudolf Nageli	ATM-2273	5299
	7590 08/05/2003			
Virgil H. Ma			EXAM	INER
Fisher, Christen & Sabol			TSOY, ELENA	
Suite 1401 1725 K Street	N W			
Washington, I		·	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		1762	
		DATE MAILED: 08/05/2003	3	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		09/726,372	NAGELI ET AL.
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	-	Elena Tsoy	1762
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app		
Period fo	or Reply		
I HE - Extermiter - If the - If NO - Failu - Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir or within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABADONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication.
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 F	ebruary 2003 .	
2a) <u></u> □		s action is non-final.	
3) <u> </u>	Since this application is in condition for allowa closed in accordance with the practice under <i>l</i> on of Claims	nce except for formal matters, pi Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	rosecution as to the merits is 153 O.G. 213.
4)🖂	Claim(s) 28-55 is/are pending in the application	n.	
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw		
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>28-55</u> is/are rejected.		
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers	election requirement.	·
9)[] 7	The specification is objected to by the Examiner		
10)□ 1	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ accept	ted or b)☐ objected to by the Exar	miner.
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the		
11)[T	he proposed drawing correction filed on		
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in repl	ly to this Office action.	
12) 🗌 T	he oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	miner.	
riority u	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	•	
13)🛛 .	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).
a)[∑	All b) Some * c) None of:		
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received.	
:	2. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received in Application	on No
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priorit application from the International Bure ee the attached detailed Office action for a list o	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	,
	cknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	•	
_a)	☐ The translation of the foreign language prov cknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	isional application has been rece	eived.
ttachment(•		
) 🔲 Notice	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal P	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) atent Application (PTO-152)
Patent and Tra O-326 (Rev		on Summary	Part of Paper No. 17

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on July 14, 2003 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. Amendment filed on July 14, 2003 has been entered. New claim 55 has been added. Claims 28-55 are pending in the application.

Specification

3. The amendment filed on November 26, 2002 stands objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 as introducing <u>new matter</u> into the disclosure for the reasons of record as set forth in Paragraph No. 5 of the Office Action mailed on February 13, 2003 (Paper No. 9).

Claim Objections

- 4. Objection to claim 28 because of informalities has been withdrawn.
- 5. Claim 55 is objected to because of the following informalities: "coextruded0coated" in line 4 from the bottom seems to be incorrect. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 1762

- 7. Claims 28-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. A recitation "the temperature at the surface of the plastic coating (14) and the adhesion-promotion agent (16) lies *below* the crystallite melt point (Tk) of the plastic" in independent claim 28 is a <u>new matter</u> since it was not described in the specification as filed.
- 8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 9. Rejection of claims 28-54 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 11. Claims 28, 29, 51, 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Heyes et al (US 5,093,208) for the reasons of record as set forth in Paragraph No. 9 of the Office Action mailed on February 13, 2003 (Paper No. 9) since claim 55 is a substantial duplicate of the claim 28.

.Application/Control Number: 09/726,372

Art Unit: 1762

12. Claim 55 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Heyes et al (US 5,093,208).

Heyes et al disclose a process for production of an aluminum foil (See column 2, lines 15-24) coated with a (sealable and sterilizible) plastic based on polypropylene (PP) consisting of co-extruding the plastic with maleic anhydride (MAH) graft modified PP (an adhesion promoting agent) and combining co-extruded PP composite of Type I with the aluminum foil between two rollers (See Fig. 4; Table I, type H; column 3, line 35; column 8, lines 9-19), the temperature at the outer surface of the plastic lies below the (crystallite) melt point (Tk) of the plastic (See column 3, lines 25, 46-47), then passing continuously the coated aluminum foil through a heater 10 (oven) to increase the adhesion strength between the aluminum foil and the plastic coating (See Fig. 1; column 7, lines 12-16) with a temperature set so that the temperature at the outer surface of the plastic lies above the (crystallite) melt point (Tk) of the plastic (See column 3, lines 48-51), and quenching (cooling in a shock-like manner) the coated aluminum foil such that the crystalline plastic is converted to non-crystalline or amorphous form (i.e. crystalline proportion at least in the surface area of the cooled PP layer is as small as possible) (See column 1, lines 45-47; column 2, lines 1-15; column 3, lines 39).

It is the Examiner's position that the surface area of the cooled PP layer has claimed properties such that if the quenched non-crystalline plastic still has small amount of crystals, then the crystal grains are as small as possible *inherently* since it is produced by a method identical or substantially identical processes to that of claimed invention.

It is held that where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical

Art Unit: 1762

processes, claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent. See MPEP 2111.02, 2112.01. In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). "When the PTO shows a sound basis for believing that the products of the applicant and the prior art are the same, the applicant has the burden of showing that they are not." In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 14. Claims 30-50, 53, 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heyes et al (US 5,093,208) in view of Takano et al (US 5,837,360) for the reasons of record as set forth in Paragraph No. 11 of the Office Action mailed on February 13, 2003 (Paper No. 9).

Conclusion

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elena Tsoy whose telephone number is (703) 605-1171. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shrive Beck can be reached on (703) 308-2333. The fax phone numbers for the

Application/Control Number: 09/726,372

2750y

Art Unit: 1762

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Page 6

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Elena Tsoy Examiner

Art Unit 1762

August 1, 2003